



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,055	02/20/2004	Robert E. Buxbaum	REB-1360201	6857
25006 7590 02/04/2009 GIFTORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 48007-7021				
EXAMINER WARTALOWICZ, PAUL A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/04/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/784,055

**Applicant(s)**

BUXBAUM, ROBERT E.

**Examiner**

PAUL A. WARTALOWICZ

**Art Unit**

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the rejection fails to properly enumerate the rationale underlying the rejection, namely motivation in Towler that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify Towler to arrive at the claimed invention.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantages of purifying a product of a process such that the product can be used in applications that require a certain purity. This knowledge is generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. This is especially true given that Towler is drawn to a method of purifying a hydrogen stream for use in a fuel cell. Holland is also drawn to a method of purifying hydrogen for use in a fuel cell. One of ordinary skill would readily understand that there would be at least a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant argues that the hydrogen separation device is separate from the reactor and that Holland teaches away from placing the hydrogen separator in the secondary fuel processing reactor.

However, the embodiment of Holland relied upon does not teach the use of a compressor between the secondary fuel processor and the hydrogen separator (col. 7, lines 46-61). Therefore, there is no teaching in the art that suggests that this particular embodiment could not be made integral. *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ

347, 349 (CCPA 1965) (A claim to a fluid transporting vehicle was rejected as obvious over a prior art reference which differed from the prior art in claiming a brake drum integral with a clamping means, whereas the brake disc and clamp of the prior art comprise several parts rigidly secured together as a single unit. The court affirmed the rejection holding, among other reasons, "that the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in [the prior art] would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice.").

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towler et al. (U.S. 6409974) in view of Krumpelt et al. (U.S. 6967063).

Towler teach a process for forming hydrogen from a feedstock (col. 1) wherein a feedstock is heated with a fuel exhaust stream (col. 10) and then is fed to a reformer and an endothermic product and hydrogen are produced (col. 4, 6) and then fed to a shift reaction zone (col. 7) wherein hydrogen gas and waste gas are produced (col. 8), wherein the waste gas is burned to provide heat to the reformer reaction (col. 8, 9).

As to the limitation of burning feedstock to said burner to provide heat to the reactor, Towler teach that the burner fuel comprises natural gas, which is the composition of the feedstock (col. 5, 9). This burner fuel is fed to the combustion zone with combustion gas at efficient conditions (col. 6).

Regarding the limitation of said feedstock is preheated within a pump supplied boiler, it appears that this limitation is a product by process limitation. The product in this case is a preheated feedstock. It appears that the preheated feedstock of the prior art is substantially similar as that of the prior art. When the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct and not the examiner to show the same process of making. *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessman* 180 USPQ 324.

Regarding the limitation of monitoring the temperature and pressure, Towler teach monitoring temperature (col. 6). Although Towler does not explicitly teach monitoring pressure, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to monitor pressure as Towler teach monitoring reaction conditions (col. 6).

As to the limitation of "providing feedstock to an exothermic reactor" and "allowing sufficient residence time for said feedstock in said reactor to undergo an endothermic reaction", it appears that these limitations are contradictory and it is unclear what is being claimed.

Regarding the limitation wherein combustible flow gas is provided stoichiometrically to burn raffinate, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantages of providing stoichiometric amounts of combustible gas such as efficiency and optimization of the reaction between the combustible gas and the raffinate.

Towler fails to teach that hydrogen is passed through a membrane to thereby separate the hydrogen from the raffinate stream after the water gas shift reaction.

Towler is drawn to a method of purifying a hydrogen stream for use in a fuel cell (col. 1). Holland is also drawn to a method of purifying hydrogen for use in a fuel cell (col. 4, 5).

Holland teach a method for producing hydrogen (col. 1) wherein two reactions proceed, the first being a reforming reaction and the second being a water gas shift reaction, whereby the product stream of the water gas shift reaction is purified by passing the hydrogen through a hydrogen permeable membrane and leaving the raffinate (col. 4, lines 15-26; col. 7, lines 46-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide the product stream of the water gas shift reaction is purified by passing the hydrogen through a hydrogen permeable membrane

and leaving the raffinate (col. 4, lines 15-26; col. 7, lines 46-61) in Towler in order to purify the product stream of the gas shift reaction as taught by Holland.

Regarding the limitation of placing the hydrogen separator in the secondary fuel processing reactor, it would have been obvious to make integral the parts of Holland. *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965) (A claim to a fluid transporting vehicle was rejected as obvious over a prior art reference which differed from the prior art in claiming a brake drum integral with a clamping means, whereas the brake disc and clamp of the prior art comprise several parts rigidly secured together as a single unit. The court affirmed the rejection holding, among other reasons, "that the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in [the prior art] would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice.")

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL A. WARTALOWICZ whose telephone number is (571)272-5957. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6 M-Th and 8:30-5 on Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Wartalowicz  
January 31, 2009

Steven Bos  
Primary Examiner  
A.U. 1793

/Steven Bos/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793